

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/204,102

Applicant(s)

HOUH ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin C. Harper

Art Unit

2666

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin C. Harper.

(3) _____.

(2) John J. McGlew (Reg. No. 31,903).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 5,13,30 and 36.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreement was made to amend claim 5 to clarify that the reset timer allowed an additional time period during which a packet is attempted to be forwarded. Claim 13 was agreed to be canceled in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Examiner considered local audio data to be time-sensitive data in the rejection of claim 1 of the previous Office Action. Examiner believes it was an oversight was made in indicating claim 13 as containing allowable subject matter in the previous Office Action. Claim 30 improperly depended upon canceled claim 1 and agreement was made to have claim 30 depend on claim 15. Applicants previously indicated claim 36 as canceled but the claim has not yet been canceled in the application.